

of the U.S./Mexico land border in southern Arizona for over 30 years. Their methods of capturing narcotics smugglers combine modern technology and ancient tracking techniques, which have proven to be highly successful.

However, the Shadow Wolves unit's direction was compromised when it was absorbed into the Customs Border Patrol, and its unique identity was threatened. Not only was this action harmful to the security benefits from the Shadow Wolves' connection with the community and the respect of its cultural makeup, it significantly lowered morale within the unit.

This bill would seek to resolve this issue by returning the Shadow Wolves to the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement. It also includes provisions that would set the Shadow Wolves' pay scale at the same rate as ICE Special Agents and grant the Chief Officer a rank equivalent to a resident agent-in-charge of the ICE Office of Investigations.

This would not only significantly improve moral within the unit but increase the efficiency of the border security within that region. Thus I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to help continue to protect the security of our borders.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE: A LOOMING EPIDEMIC

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a crucial challenge that our generation will face. In the June 27, 2006 edition of the Washington Post, an opinion editorial titled, "Open the Door to Curing Alzheimer's" by Robert Essner describes the urgency that exists in declaring research on Alzheimer's disease as a top priority for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). In the meantime, Alzheimer's has been accepted as an inevitable phase of aging. However, this needn't be the case because with enough research, more successful treatment can be discovered, and this research can easily deliver a cure.

However, it is not only the mere personal and emotional burden caused by this degenerative disease that should be of concern to all of us as legislators. This disease will also cause a serious economic drain on our funds. With the baby-boomer generation quickly approaching as a risk group for Alzheimer's, it is estimated that this disease will claim 1 in every 10 people of this sizeable population; that is, about 14 million baby-boomer elders will have Alzheimer's. Essner estimates that with such an immense population of Alzheimer's patients, the costs of care for this disease will "drain—if not bankrupt" the federal and state health care budgets.

Given these approximations, a vast majority of us are at risk for either becoming Alzheimer's patients, caring for one in our immediate family, or at least know a patient in our extended family. The article emphasizes how costly Alzheimer's truly is. Today, a whopping one third of all of Medicare funds are directed towards care for Alzheimer's patients. Last year alone, \$91 billion in Medicare dollars was spent on those suffering from this disease. Furthermore, Alzheimer's incurs \$19,000 a year in "out-of-pocket" costs for the families of patients.

Therefore, it is crucial that entities from the science, regulatory, and industry fields join forces to work as quickly as possible to thwart this disease and the imminent epidemic that Alzheimer's is bound to cause. If not enough financial support is provided for research and a cure for this possibly avoidable illness, we will continue to risk delaying the discovery of an effective treatment for Alzheimer's and this will potentially adversely impact on millions and millions of people. Essner says it best when he asserts, "we could make my generation the last to dread Alzheimer's," and I believe this is a matter of obligation, not option.

OPEN THE DOOR TO CURING ALZHEIMER'S—
WHY THIS RESEARCH MUST BECOME AN URGENT PRIORITY

(By Robert Essner)

JUNE 27, 2006.—America is getting serious about preparing for the possibility of an outbreak of avian flu. Would that it could muster the same sense of urgency for a disease that is already here and is certain to become epidemic. The disease is Alzheimer's. It will claim one in 10 baby boomers, create a personal and fiscal nightmare for their families, and drain—if not bankrupt—state and federal health-care budgets. Medicare now pays one-third of all its health-care funds for some 4.5 million Alzheimer's patients. Are we ready for three times that number?

Alzheimer's doesn't have to be an inevitable part of aging. It is a disease for which research can find a cure, or at least a more effective treatment. In that way, it could be like HIV-AIDS—a disease that, for most sufferers, went from a lethal diagnosis to a treatable chronic condition within six years of its discovery. One breakthrough AIDS drug rapidly led to another, because we mobilized pandemic-strength muscle against it. In addition, the Food and Drug Administration created review and approval processes that helped new therapies for AIDS reach people who needed them years ahead of what would have otherwise been possible.

The FDA now needs to give the same priority status to drugs for Alzheimer's as it has for AIDS and cancer treatments. And, the federal government needs to designate Alzheimer's as a No. 1 research priority.

If we don't do these things, the projections are staggering. Within the next five years, nearly a half-million new Alzheimer's cases will be diagnosed annually, as 78 million baby boomers reach age 65. Given those numbers, most of us will either become an Alzheimer's patient, care for one in our home or know a patient in our extended family. By robbing victims of memory, Alzheimer's strips away individuality, dignity and independence.

Alzheimer's is expensive. It requires \$19,000 a year in out-of-pocket costs for each caregiver family. Last year Medicare spent \$91 billion for Alzheimer's. That figure will nearly double in just four years—and keep soaring as 14 million cases are diagnosed in boomers' lifetimes.

Within the pharmaceutical industry, there are 28 Alzheimer's compounds in development. But progress on all fronts is unconscionably slow considering the looming shadow of this epidemic. And, given the complexity of the disease, no single research organization has the resources to research all its facets as quickly as we must.

At Wyeth alone, we've committed hundreds of millions of dollars to this research. We are moving in a promising direction by testing eight innovative approaches. Right now no one can say that any one of them will work. But we believe that, through taking multiple "shots on goal" in our research labs, a treatment can be found.

In October 2001 Wyeth started its Alzheimer's research program with a vaccine approach designed to stimulate the body to stop the buildup of beta-amyloid plaque in the brain—thought to be a critical part of the disease process. While that initial effort proved unsuccessful, it did not deter us from moving ahead with another vaccine approach. This new vaccine program is in the clinic. Furthest along in development at Wyeth is a pill—a potent serotonin receptor antagonist that may enhance cognition in moderate cases and significantly enhance the quality of life. Another promising approach is an antibody directed against beta-amyloid. By removing these plaques, we hope to stop the disease from progressing.

But it is imperative for industry, scientists and regulators to work together to help us reach our goal even faster. We need a sense of urgency, a commitment to collaboration that will lead to a concerted, focused effort to prevent this impending epidemic.

A TV journalist who cares for a husband diagnosed with the disease wrote in a recent issue of the scientific journal *Alzheimer's & Dementia*: "Right now the majority of Alzheimer's victims and their caregivers are our parents. Their plight is our future. . . . We are desperately in need of access to new therapies instead of being left with only agonizing decisions."

For every month we hesitate, we will find ourselves spending down the nation's health-care budget to care for the demise of millions of people. We should be preparing to cure them. We could make my generation the last to dread Alzheimer's. It is time to accelerate the pace of our efforts and take the battle to a level on par with our hope.

THE AMIA BOMBING REMEMBERED

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the 12th anniversary of the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) bombing in Buenos Aires, Argentina. We cannot forget the 86 individuals who were killed and the hundreds who were wounded on July 14, 1994 in a terrorist bombing of the AMIA building.

This largest single incident of terrorism against Jews since World War II was an affront to humanity and the principle of freedom that our country so dearly values. As the home of the largest Jewish community in Latin America, Argentina's Jewish community center was leveled and reduced to rubble along with nearby buildings.

Unfortunately, nobody has yet to be convicted for the bombing although many allegations have been made. It is therefore all the more important that we memorialize this day.

The heinous assault sent shock waves throughout South America, and the international community.

As American citizens we share a common bond with Argentinians as being victims of terror ourselves. September 11 has only reaffirmed that terrorism in any form or any place will not be tolerated. By remembering those whose lives were affected or taken by terror we affirm the value that life and security serves in a functional society.

I commend Congressman TOM LANTOS and Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for

their work in commemorating the victims of the AMIA bombing and the individual lives lost to hatred and terror. The Latino and Latin American Institute of the American Jewish Committee deserves much credit and praise for initiating this important remembrance of an attack that affected the international community.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA LEWIS OF
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I rise today to pay tribute to a long-time friend, Patricia Lewis, or "Patsy," as she is affectionately known in my community. Patsy will be honored in the City of Worcester tonight for her outstanding work and unyielding service to the citizens of Massachusetts and our Nation. For 20 years Patsy has served as the Executive Director of the Worcester Community Action Council, Inc., an agency that was started in 1965 as the locally designated "community action" agency for the Economic Opportunity Act under the Johnson Administration. Today, WCAC serves as an umbrella agency for 25 education and social service programs.

Since her arrival, Patsy devoted most of her time fighting the good fight, serving as an advocate for the poor and the needy with dignity and respect. She and her staff along with the Board of Directors are a force to reckon with in the fight against poverty.

Mr. Speaker, Patsy's list of accomplishments is long. She doubled WCAC's annual budget; added and expanded services into Southern Worcester County; initiated new programs throughout WCAC's service area, including fuel assistance, Head Start, Americorps/Cityworks, Individual Development Accounts and Food Stamp outreach. Today, WCAC serves more than 11,000 households in Central and Southern Worcester County with an emphasis on developing self-sufficiency for low-income families.

Patsy has served on numerous human service organizations, including the Greater Worcester Community Foundation, United Way Women's Initiative, and the YWCA. She has been a joint faculty member of Worcester State College and Clark University. She is an alumna of Manchester College, Ohio State University, and Boston University.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Patsy is an individual who cares about people and I am truly appreciative of the work she has done for the residents of the 3rd Congressional district. As a result of her leadership and vision our community is a better place. For her outstanding service I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring Patricia "Patsy" Lewis.

WORLD CUP VICTORY OR COLLEGE
GRADUATES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, with the disappointing ending of the quest for the World

Cup through a loss to Ghana last week, I find it appropriate to bring to the attention of Congress an article written by David Brooks, a columnist with the New York Times, entitled "Our World Cup Edge." The article discusses our country's apparent disadvantage in skill and experience in this worldwide soccer competition, but touts the American university system, which produces most of the players on the U.S. team, as being the best.

While the U.S. team unfortunately was eliminated in the first round of the competition, our team can boast having the most college graduates. American athletes go to college to foster their athletic abilities, whereas Europeans are removed from school at a young age and placed in specialized training programs.

The article maintains that the higher level of education American athletes receive helps to boost our economy. American universities greatly contribute to a sense of community. Such a phenomenon dates back to the founding of these schools as autonomous, devoid of government intervention. Such a lack of government involvement allows American universities to remain competitors in the ideas market. By contrast, the European university system is controlled by the government and is therefore not very competitive. European governments encourage equality amongst their universities.

American universities are at the top. As Mr. Brooks cites, not only have our schools fostered strong sports programs, but they also build camaraderie through extracurricular activities. American universities also lead to business and cultural centers, while the European system does not have nearly as large an effect. With globalization, American universities have become increasingly more desirable, further benefiting our society.

I commend Mr. Brooks' analysis of the importance and success of our American universities. However, I would like to push Congress even further in identifying the challenge presented by the need to produce more engineers and scientists in today's increasingly competitive technological age. Our country has done an admirable job in ensuring our universities are the best, but we must continue working to keep up with technology by educating our students in the scientific fields.

I thank Mr. Brooks for his thorough comparison of university systems. I therefore submit for the RECORD Mr. Brooks' column in the June 22nd issue of the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 2006]

OUR WORLD CUP EDGE

(By David Brooks)

Going into today's World Cup match against Ghana, no American player has managed to put a ball into the back of the net, but the U.S. team does lead the world in one vital category: college degrees.

Most of the American players attended college. Eddie Pope went to the University of North Carolina, Kasey Keller attended the University of Portland and Marcus Hahnemann went to Seattle Pacific.

Many of the elite players from the rest of the world, on the other hand, were pulled from regular schools at early ages and sent to professional training academies. Among those sharp-elbowed, hypercompetitive Europeans, for example, Zinedine Zidane was playing for A.S. Cannes by age 16, Luis Figo was playing for Sporting Lisbon at 17, and David Beckham attended Tottenham Hotspur's academy and signed with Manchester United as a trainee at 16.

The difference in preparation is probably bad for America's World Cup prospects, but it's good for America's economic and political prospects. That's because the difference in soccer training is part of a bigger phenomenon. American universities play a much broader social role than do universities elsewhere around the world. They not only serve as the training grounds for professional athletes, unthinkable in most other nations, they also contribute more to the cultures and economies around them.

The American university system was born with expansionist genes. As early Americans spread out across the frontier, they created not only new religious sects, but new colleges, too. The Dartmouth College case of 1819 restricted government's efforts to interfere in higher education. As the centuries rolled on, government did more to finance higher education, starting with the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862, but the basic autonomy of colleges and universities was preserved. They remained, and remain, spirited competitors in the marketplace of ideas, status, talent and donations.

The European system, by contrast, is state-dominated and uncompetitive. During the 19th century, governments in Spain, France and Germany abolished the universities' medieval privileges of independence. Governments took over funding and control, and imposed radical egalitarian agendas. Universities could not select students on merit, and faculty members became civil servants.

The upshot is that the competitive American universities not only became the best in the world—8 out of the top 10 universities are American—they also remained ambitious and dynamic. They are much more responsive to community needs.

Not only have they created ambitious sports programs to build character among students and a sense of solidarity across the community, they also offer a range of extracurricular activities and student counseling services unmatched anywhere else. While the arts and letters faculties are sometimes politically cloistered, the rest of the university programs are integrated into society, performing an array of social functions.

They serve as business incubation centers (go to Palo Alto). With their cultural and arts programs, they serve as retiree magnets (go to Charlottesville). With their football teams, they bind communities and break down social distinctions (people in Alabama are fiercely loyal to the Crimson Tide, even though most have not actually attended the university).

State-dominated European universities, by contrast, cast much smaller shadows. A Centre for European Reform report noted "a drab uniformity" across the systems. Talented professors leave. Funding lags. Antibusiness snobbery limits entrepreneurial activity. Research suffers. In the first half of the 20th century, 73 percent of Nobel laureates were based in Europe. Between 1995 and 2004, 19 percent were.

The two systems offer a textbook lesson in how to and how not to use government. In one system, the state supports local autonomy and private creativity. In the other, the state tries to equalize, but merely ends up centralizing and stultifying. This contrast might be worth dwelling upon as we contemplate health care reform, K-12 education reform and anything else government might touch.

The dynamic American university system is now undergoing yet another revolution—globalization. More foreign students are coming to the U.S., and more want to stay after they get their degrees.

This is bound to be great for American society. It will probably do almost nothing for our future World Cup prospects.